

September 27, 1979

STAT
Procurement Division
Central Intelligence Agency
Washington, D.C. 20505

Re: RFP-7976

STAT Dear

I am very concerned with your decision to give the order to Remco. My reasons are as follows:

Part of this bid was for moving of existing equipment. Since only the original supplier or manufacturer could make the move without jeopardizing warranty or maintenance agreements, this should be a separate negotiation. Why was this included with new equipment of a different manufacturer and design? Please reply.

The term "Elecompact" describes a product manufactured in Japan. It is a movable shelving system. The United States has many manufacturers of movable shelving systems. The Estey System has a complete U.L. Listing and provides more usable capacity than the Elecompact System. Our price is approximately \$16,000.00 less than the foreign import.

Why is the C.I.A. buying an import at approximately 40% more money when they could buy an American made product with more capacity, identical safety features and complete U.L. Listing for the entire system? Please reply.

Our site visit clearly indicates that you cannot use 2 fixed and 10 movable ranges. You need one fixed and 11 movable ranges. What is Remco furnishing? Please reply.

Page #2 of you RFP - "Range Selector Button" - we hold a patent for this feature. What is Remco furnishing? Please reply.

Page 2

September 27, 1979

[REDACTED]

STAT

Your evaluation lists price as part of the evaluation criteria. We quoted 90 days. You say Remco quoted 60 days. How can this be worth 40% more money when you used $3\frac{1}{2}$ weeks of time to make an award? This is not understandable or reasonable. Please reply.

Perhaps the decision was made by others within the C.I.A. If so, will you please ask that person to respond to the replies, as requested in this letter.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

ESTEY CORPORATION

Steve Schneid

SS/rj

cc: Young & Watson, Inc.
Phil Watson